

Appl. No. 10/723384  
Reply to Action dated 1/5/2006  
Page 2

### REMARKS

Claims 1-8 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Mehney et al. (US 6,039,344). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The rejection erroneously asserts that Figure 2 of Mehney looks identical to the arrangement shown in applicant's Figure 10A, and the circuit arrangement shown in Figure 3 of Mehney seems to be the same as shown in applicant's Figure 10B. Figure 2 of Mehney shows two identical strain gauges 81 and 84 placed in a compression state, and two more identical strain gauges 82 and 83 placed in a tension state. Strain gauges 81 and 82 are placed onto an upper surface of a mounting member and into the upper legs of a Wheatstone Bridge circuit, while strain gauges 83 and 84 are placed onto the lower surface of the same mounting member and into the lower legs of the same Wheatstone Bridge circuit shown in Figure 3 of Mehney.

In contradistinction, applicant's invention of claim 3 places all four strain resistors R1o, R2o, R3o and R4o onto only one side of a first mounting member associated with an outer weight detecting unit as shown in Figure 7A; while all four strain resistors R1i, R2i, R3i and R4i are placed onto only one side of a second mounting member associated with an inner weight detecting unit as shown in Figure 8A. A first Wheatstone Bridge associated with strain resistors R1o-R4o generates outputs at terminals A and B as shown in Figure 7B; while a second Wheatstone Bridge associated with strain resistors R1i-R4i generates outputs at terminals C and D as shown in Figure 8B. The outputs of both Wheatstone Bridge circuits are combined in a calculating circuit shown in Figure 9. Figure 10 A is simply a side elevation view showing the first and second mounting members having the strain resistors attached thereto. This is distinctly different from the invention of Mehney that discloses a single mounting member for all four strain gauges, and only a single Wheatstone Bridge circuit. The structure of claim 3 is clearly different from the structure disclosed by Mehney; and the method of claim 1, while achievable using the structure of claim 1, is not achievable using the structure disclosed by Mehney.

Appl. No. 10/723384  
Reply to Action dated 1/5/2006  
Page 3

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 3 are patentable over Mehney. Claim 2 is patentable over Mehney since claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claims 4-8 are patentable over Mehney since claims 4-8 depend ultimately from claim 3.

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: March 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902-0902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Curtis B. Hamre". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/lad